

**REMARKS**

The applicant originally submitted claims 1-21 in this application. In this response to the current Office Action, the applicant has amended claims 1 and 8, and canceled claims 2 and 12-21. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-11 remain pending in this application.

The applicant hereby affirms the provisional election with traverse that was made during a telephone conversation with Michael Morra on January 4, 2006 to prosecute the invention of Group 1, claims 1-11. The applicant has canceled claims 12-21, thereby withdrawing them from consideration.

The Examiner objected to claim 8 under 37 CFR §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In response to the claim objection, the applicant has rewritten the claim in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner. The applicant respectfully submits that the claim, as rewritten, no longer is objectionable. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 8 under 37 CFR §1.75(c).

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner states that claim 8 is unclear as to what the invention claims. As discussed hereinabove, the applicant has rewritten claim 8 in independent form. In view thereof, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 no longer is unclear with respect to what the invention claims. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cocchini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,876). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the remarks set forth below.

The applicant has amended independent claim 1 to further recite that the optical fiber preform is rotated at a rotation rate less than approximately 600

revolutions per minute (rpm). Nothing in Cocchini et al. discloses or suggests the applicant's invention as recited in claim 1, as amended. The Cocchini et al. reference is directed to the method for applying spin to an optical fiber during the process of process of applying a coating to the optical fiber. The Cocchini et al. reference accomplishes this by rotating the die that applies the coating to the optical fiber. The method disclosed in Cocchini et al. does not involve rotating an optical fiber preform.

In the background section of Cocchini et al., reference is made to a prior art method of rotating the optical fiber preform at 600 revolutions per minute. However, the Cocchini et al. reference states that such method is usually unsuitable. As discussed hereinabove, the applicant's method as recited in the claim 1, as amended, rotates an optical fiber preform at a rotation rate less than 600 rpm. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Cocchini et al. of rotating an optical fiber preform less than 600 rpm.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the Cocchini et al. reference does not disclose or suggest the applicant's invention as recited in claim 1, as amended. The remaining claims depend directly from claim 1. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cocchini et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fujimaki et al. (WO00/69782; U.S. Patent No. 6,789,399). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the remarks set forth below.

As discussed hereinabove, the applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite that the optical fiber preform is rotated at a rotation rate less than approximately 600 rpm. Nothing in Fujimaki et al. discloses or suggests rotating an optical fiber preform, much less rotating an optical fiber preform at a rotation rate less than 600 rpm. The Fujimaki et al. reference focuses on the twisting of an optical fiber, not a preform, as the reference describes a method and apparatus for measuring twisting of an optical fiber.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that the Fujimaki et al. reference does not disclose or suggest the applicant's invention as recited in claim 1, as amended. As stated hereinabove, the remaining claims depend directly from claim 1. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fujimaki et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Henderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,748). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the remarks set forth below.

The Henderson et al. reference discloses the rotation of an optical fiber preform, as opposed to the optical fiber after it has been drawn. However, nothing in Henderson et al. discloses or suggests rotating an optical fiber preform at a rotation rate less than 600 rpm. The Henderson et al. reference discloses prior art methods that rotate preforms at rates greater than 5000 rpm. However, as discussed in Henderson et al. (and in the applicant's specification), such relatively high spin rates are impractical.

The Henderson et al. reference focuses on rotating an optical fiber according to a variety of spin functions, some of which are not entirely sinusoidal. Also, as discussed, the Henderson et al. reference suggests that rotation of the preform, as opposed to rotation of the optical fiber can be performed. However, nothing in Henderson et al. discloses or suggests rotating an optical fiber preform at a rotation rate less than 600 rpm.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that the Henderson et al. reference does not disclose or suggest the applicant's invention as recited in the claim 1, as amended. As stated hereinabove, the remaining claims depend directly from claim 1. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Henderson et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimaki et al. or Cocchini et al., as applied to claim 1 above,

and further in view of Hart, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,881). As discussed hereinabove, neither the Fujimaki et al. reference nor the Cocchini et al. reference discloses or suggests the applicant's invention as recited in claim 1, as amended. The Hart, Jr. et al. reference, which is cited for its disclosure of spinning an optical fiber as it is being drawn, does not cure the deficiencies of Fujimaki et al. or Cocchini et al. with respect to the applicant's invention as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Claim 9 depends indirectly from independent claim 1 and incorporates all of the features of claim 1. Furthermore, claim 9 includes other features that, when combined with the subject matter of independent claim 1, are not shown in or suggested by the art of record. In view of these remarks, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Fujimaki et al. or Cocchini et al. in view of Hart, Jr. et al.

May 9, 2006

The applicant submits that all claims now are in patentable form, and respectfully urge that all the claims be allowed and the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to call the attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Zhi Zhou

By:



Michael A. Morra, Attorney

Reg. No. 28975

(770) 798-2040

Date:

May 9, 2006

Fitel USA Corp.

Docket Administrator

2000 Northeast Expressway

Suite 2H02

Norcross, GA 30071-2906